

**REMARKS****I. Status of the Claims**

Claims 1-5, 9-10, 12-29, 32-41, 46-50, 52-66 and 68-74 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 20, 25, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 46, 56-60, 62, 65, 66 and 68 are amended. Claim 67 is cancelled without prejudice. Claims 69-74 are added.

**II. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102**

Claims 1-3, 9, 10, 12-15, 19-22, 25-29, 32, 35, 36, 37-41, 46-48, 52-56 and 60-68 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,484,156 ("Gupta"). Claims 1, 20, 32, 46, 56, 60, 62 and 64-66 are amended and the rejection is respectfully traversed.

*Independent Claims 1 and 46*

Independent method claim 1 describes a method for providing a user with media segments in an order selected by the user. Claim 1 has been amended to require storing a first plurality of information segments in a database, and displaying, in a first region of a display device, a second plurality of information segments selected from the first plurality of stored information segments, at least a portion of each information segment in the second plurality being displayed. Amended claim 1 further requires "allowing the user to select information segments from among the displayed information segments," "displaying in a sequence, in a second region of the display device different from the first region, indicators representing respective information segments selected by a user," and "allowing the user to rearrange the sequence of the indicators in the second region to affect an order in which the user selected information segments are to be presented to the user." Claim 46 is a system claim that corresponds to claim 1, and has been amended in a similar manner.

Gupta discloses a system that displays, in a window, annotations identifying stored multimedia streams resulting from a keyword search performed by a user. (Col. 16, lines 39-49; also see Fig. 11, box 402). The user can reorder the annotations shown in the window. (Col. 17, lines 48-57). The user can also delete annotations from the window. (Col. 17, lines 9-17). If a user selects a particular annotation, a “preview” of that annotation appears in a second window. (Col. 16, lines 58-64; also see Fig. 11, box 416). When the user is satisfied with the annotations in the list and the order thereof, the user can select a “start” button, and the media streams associated with the annotations remaining in the list are played to the user in the order in which they are displayed. (Col. 17, lines 19-35).

Nowhere does Gupta teach or suggest “displaying, in a first region of a display device, a second plurality of information segments selected from the first plurality of stored information segments, at least a portion of each information segment in the second plurality being displayed” and “displaying in a sequence, in a second region of the display device different from the first region, indicators representing respective information segments selected by a user,” as required by amended claim 1, or a device for doing so, as required by amended claim 46. Gupta only discloses a first window (box 402 of Fig. 11) showing a list of annotations resulting from a search, and a second window (box 416 of Fig. 11) in which a “preview” of a selected media segment can be displayed. However, the second “box 416” shows no more than selected information relating to a single media segment (based on a “particular annotation identifier”). The second “box 416” does not display, “in a sequence,” multiple indicators representing respective information segments selected by a user, as required by amended claims 1 and 46.

The system described by Gupta is significantly less user-friendly than the claimed system and method. The claimed invention enables a user to view, in a “first region” of a display

device, summaries of various media segments (the claimed “second plurality”), for example, and to construct a “virtual shopping cart” of media segments in a “second region” of the display device, as described in the Specification at page 3, lines 1-13, and at page 9, line 7 to page 15, line 11. Allowing the user to simultaneously (1) browse at leisure through summaries of media segments displayed in a “first region,” and (2) view his or her “virtual shopping cart” displayed in a “second region” provides a high level of convenience to the user. Gupta does not provide the same high level of convenience. Gupta presents a list of “annotations” in a first window (box 402). The user manipulates the annotations shown in the first window, and the final play list is shown in the same window. Accordingly, to construct a desired play list from an original list of annotations shown in the first window (box 402), the user is required to delete annotations from those shown in the first window, and/or reorder the annotations shown in the first window. Depending on the number of annotations returned in the search, many deletions may be required. In contrast, in accordance with the method described in amended claim 1, since the user can select the information segments for placement in a second window, little or no deletion of unwanted information segments is required.

The system disclosed by Gupta is not merely less convenient, it fails to offer certain features that are possible in the claimed method and system. For example, Gupta does not disclose how a user might “recapture” an annotation that has been accidentally deleted. In the claimed method and system, this is not an obstacle. If a user deletes an “indicator” from the “second region,” and subsequently changes his or her mind, the desired indicator can easily be put back into the “second region” by browsing through the media segments displayed in the “first region” and selecting the corresponding media segment.

None of the other cited art teaches or suggests the limitations discussed above, either.

Therefore, amended claim 1 and 46, and their respective dependent claims, are patentable over the cited art.

*Independent Claim 20*

Independent method claim 20 sets forth a method for presenting to a user media segments in an order selected by the user. Claim 20 has been amended to require “displaying, in a first region of a display device, a plurality of information segments selected from a database, the one or more information segments relating to at least one topic selected by a user or by the system, at least a portion of each information segment in the plurality being displayed” and “receiving from the user selections of the one or more information segments displayed in the first region.” Claim 20 has been further amended to require “displaying, in a second region of the display device different from the first region, indicators representing the respective information segments selected by the user, the indicators having a sequence corresponding to an order in which information segments are selected by the user.” Amended claim 20 additionally requires “allowing the user to select an indicator in the sequence and change the position of the selected indicator with respect to the other indicators in the sequence” and “presenting the user selected information segments represented by the respective indicators in the sequence in the same order as the respective indicators in the sequence.”

Claim 25, which depends from amended claim 20, has been amended to conform to the amended language of claim 20.

For the reasons discussed above, Gupta fails to teach or suggest “displaying, in a first region of a display device, a plurality of information segments selected from a database, the one or more information segments relating to at least one topic selected by a user, at least a portion of each information segment in the plurality being displayed” and “displaying, in a second region of

the display device different from the first region, indicators representing the respective information segments selected by the user, the indicators having a sequence corresponding to an order in which information segments are selected by the user,” as required by amended claim 20.

As discussed above, Gupta discloses no more than using a second window (“box 416”) to display preview information relating to a single media segment, and does not display multiple indicators in the “second region,” as required by amended claim 20. Logically, then, Gupta also does not teach or suggest indicators having “sequence corresponding to an order in which information segments are selected by the user,” or “allowing the user to select an indicator in the sequence and change the position of the selected indicator with respect to the other indicators in the sequence,” as also required by amended claim 20. None of the other cited art teaches or suggests these limitations, either. Therefore, amended claim 20, together with its dependent claims, are patentable over the cited art.

#### *Independent Claim 32*

Independent method claim 32 also sets forth a method for presenting to a user media segments in an order selected by the user. Claim 32 has been amended to require, among other limitations, “receiving from a user a selection of one or more topics chosen from among a plurality of displayed topics,” “displaying, in a first region of a display device, a plurality of information segments retrieved from the database that relate to the one or more selected topics, at least a portion of each information segment in the plurality being displayed in the first region,” “displaying, in a second region of a display device different from the first region, an indicator representative of at least one of the plurality of information segments,” and “arranging the indicator with at least a second indicator displayed in the second region in a sequence, the second indicator being representative of a second information segment.” For the reasons discussed

above, Gupta does not teach or suggest displaying, in a first region of a display device, a plurality of information segments retrieved from a database and displaying, in a second region of the display device different from the first region, an “indicator” and a “second indicator” representing respective information segments, as required by amended claim 32.

Gupta also does not teach or suggest “receiving from a user a selection of one or more topics chosen from among a plurality of displayed topics” and “displaying, in a first region of a display device, a plurality of information segments retrieved from the database that relate to the one or more selected topics,” as required by amended claim 32. Gupta only discloses displaying media segments that result from a keyword search.

Claims 33-35 and 37, which depend from amended claim 32, have been amended to conform to the amended language of claim 32.

None of the other cited art teaches or suggests the limitations discussed above, either. Therefore, amended claim 32 and its dependent claims are patentable over the cited art.

#### *Independent Claim 65*

Claim 65 sets forth a method for presenting to a user media segments in an order selected by the user. Claim 65 has been amended to require “displaying, in a first region of a display device, a plurality of information segments selected from a database, at least a portion of each information segment in the plurality being displayed in the first region” and “displaying simultaneously with at least one of the plurality of information segments, in a second region of the display device different from the first region, the indicators corresponding to the user selected information segments, in response to the selection of each individual information segment.” As discussed above, Gupta fails to teach or suggest “displaying, in a first region of a display device, at least a portion of one or more information segments selected from a database”

and displaying the claimed “indicators” in a second region, as required by amended claim 65.

It is additionally noted that Gupta fails to teach or suggest displaying “indicators” in a second region “simultaneously with at least one of the plurality of information segments,” as claimed. As stated above, Gupta discloses using a second window to display “preview” information concerning a single media segment only, not multiple “indicators,” as claimed. None of the other cited art teaches or suggests these limitations, either. Therefore, amended claim 65 is patentable over the cited art.

#### *Independent Claim 66*

Claim 66, as amended, sets forth a method for presenting to a user media segments in an order selected by the user. As illustrated in Fig. 2 and described in the Specification at pages 8-15, for example, the method recited in amended claim 66 allows a user to visit a website of a news organization and build a customized newscast. In accordance with the example shown in Fig. 2, when the user visits the website, various markers representing different news categories such as “Top Stories,” “Weather,” and “Sports” are displayed on the left side of the display screen (the claimed “first region”). When the user selects one of the news categories, such as “Top Stories,” a number of news stories appear in the central portion of the display screen (the “second region”), each having a headline and a news summary. The user can select from among the displayed news stories, causing corresponding “indicators” to appear in the virtual “shopping cart” displayed on the right side of the display screen (the “third region”). As previously discussed, the user can reorder the indicators and cause the news segments in the playlist to be played in a desired order.

Accordingly, claim 66 has been amended to require “storing a plurality of video files relating to a plurality of news topics in one or more databases,” and “displaying, in a first region

of a display apparatus, one or more graphical markers representing respective news topics.” Amended claim 66 further requires “receiving from a user a selection of a graphical marker corresponding to a desired news topic,” “searching the one or more databases to identify a plurality of video files associated with the desired news topic selected by a user,” and “displaying to the user, in a second region of the display apparatus different from the first region, a respective descriptor of each of the identified video files.” Amended claim 66 additionally requires “allowing the user to select, for placement into a third region of the display apparatus different from the first and second regions, individual ones of the displayed descriptors,” “displaying in the third region, in response to each selection of a descriptor, an indicator comprising at least a respective text indicative of the video file corresponding to the selected descriptor, the indicators being displayed in a sequence corresponding to an order in which the descriptors are selected by the user,” “allowing the user to rearrange the sequence of the indicators in the third region to create a second sequence,” and “presenting the video files corresponding to the indicators in third region in accordance with the second sequence.” Support for the amendments to claim 66 is found at pages 7-15, for example.

Gupta does not teach or suggest “displaying, in a first region of a display apparatus, one or more graphical markers representing respective news topics,” “receiving from a user a selection of a graphical marker corresponding to a desired news topic,” “searching the one or more databases to identify a plurality of video files associated with the desired news topic selected by a user,” and “displaying to the user, in a second region of the display apparatus different from the first region, a respective descriptor of each of the identified video files.”

While certain of the “annotations” discussed in Gupta may relate to a news topic, Gupta does not disclose displaying “graphical markers” relating to news topics, receiving a selection of a



“graphical marker” from a user, and searching one or more databases for video files associated with the selected news topic, as claimed.

Gupta also does not teach or suggest “allowing the user to select, for placement into a third region of the display apparatus different from the first and second regions, individual ones of the displayed descriptors,” and “displaying in the third region, in response to each selection of a descriptor, an indicator comprising at least a respective text indicative of the video file corresponding to the selected descriptor, the indicators being displayed in a sequence corresponding to an order in which the descriptors are selected by the user,” for reasons discussed above with respect to amended claim 1. None of the other cited art teaches or suggests these limitations, either. Therefore, amended claim 66 and its dependent claim 67 are patentable over the cited art.

### III. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

*Claims 4, 5, 16-18, 23, 24, 33, 49, 50 and 57-59*

Dependent claims 4, 5, 16-18, 23, 24, 33, 49, 50 and 57-59 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Gupta in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,263,507 (Ahmad). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 4, 5 and 16-18 depend from amended claim 1. Claims 23 and 24 depend from amended claim 20. Claim 33 depends from amended claim 32. Claims 49, 50 and 57-59 depend from amended claim 46. For the reasons set forth above, amended claims 1, 20, 32, and 46 are patentable over the cited art. Therefore, claims 4, 5, 16-18, 23, 24, 33, 49, 50 and 57-59 are also patentable over the cited art.

*Claim 34*

Dependent claim 34 depends from amended claim 32. For the reasons set forth above,

amended claim 32 is patentable over the cited art. Therefore, claim 34 is also patentable over the cited art.

#### **IV. New Claims 69-74**

New claim 69 depends from amended claim 1 and further requires that “each of the plurality of information segments is associated with at least one of a plurality of topics.” Support for new claim 69 is found at pages 7-15, for example.

New claim 70 depends from new claim 69 and further recites “displaying, in a third region of the display device, one or more graphical markers representing respective topics,” “receiving from a user a selection of a graphical marker corresponding to a desired topic,” and “displaying, in the first region, at least a portion of one or more of the stored information segments associated with the desired topic.” Support for new claim 70 is found at pages 7-15, for example.

New claim 71 depends from amended claim 1 and further requires that “the display of the one or more information segments in the first region and the display of the indicators in the second region occur simultaneously.” Support for new claim 71 is found at pages 7-15, for example.

New claim 72 depends from amended claim 1 and further requires “allowing the user to select a first information segment from among the one or more displayed information segment,” “displaying, in the second region, a first indicator representing the first information segment, in response to the user’s selection of the first information segment,” “allowing the user to select a second information segment from among the one or more displayed information segment” and “displaying, in the second region, a second indicator representing the first information segment, in response to the user’s selection of the second information segment.” New claim 72

additionally recites “wherein the first indicator precedes the second indicator in the sequence.”

Support for new claim 72 is found at page pages 7-15, for example.

New claim 73 depends from amended claim 1 and further requires that “an indicator associated with a first information segment selected by the user precedes within the sequence indicators associated with information segments selected by the user after the selection of the first information segment.” Support for new claim 73 is found at page pages 7-15, for example.

New claim 74 depends from claim 1 and further recites “wherein the at least a portion of each information segment that is displayed in the first region comprises at least a title and a summary of the segment.” Support for new claim 74 is found in Fig. 2 (items 235 and 240), for example.

For the reasons set forth above, amended claim 1 is patentable over the cited art. Therefore, new claims 69-74 are also patentable over the cited art.


## V. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, each of claims 1-5, 9-10, 12-29, 32-41, 46-50, and 52-74 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of these claims is requested and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
Kaye Scholer LLP

Date: November 3, 2006

By

  
Brandon N. Sklar  
Reg. No. 31,667  
212-836-8653

Kaye Scholer LLP  
425 Park Avenue  
New York, New York 10022